

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are pending. By this Amendment, Claims 1 and 6 are amended. Because support for the amendments to Claims 1 and 6 is provided in the application as originally filed, see Figures 6-7 for example, Applicants respectfully submit that no new subject matter is presented herein.

Claims 1-15 Recite Patentable Subject Matter

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0068110 to Matsui et al. (Matsui) in view of U.S. Patent Number 1,170,733 to Bower (Bower); as well as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,955,476 to Murai (Murai) in view of Bower.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for the following reason(s).

Claims 1 and 6 each recite a cage including, among other features, a pair of annuluses, a plurality of columns interconnecting the annuluses, and pockets defined therein for receiving cylindrical rollers between adjacent columns, the pair of annuluses extending orthogonally relative to the columns, ***wherein each column is provided with a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base that is parallel to a corresponding annulus from the pair of annuluses and toward the corresponding annulus***, and wherein each tongue of the pair of tongues is connected to a relatively planar bottom surface and which is disposed between the pair of tongues by an arcuate surface disposed between each tongue of the pair of tongues and an end of the relatively planar bottom surface. See Figures 6-7 of the instant application for an exemplary illustration of the emphasized feature(s).

The Office Action admits that Matsui and Murai each fail to disclose a pair of tongues extending radially away from a base, each tongue being connected to a relatively planar bottom surface disposed between the pair of tongues by an arcuate surface disposed between each tongue and an end of the relatively planar surface.

To cure the admitted deficiency of Matsui and Murai, the Office Action asserts the argument that Bower teaches a pair of tongues (Fig. 2) extending radially away from a base (K) for the purpose of spacing and retaining the rolling members.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion put forth by the Office Action for at least the following reason(s).

Bower teaches a cage that is used to hold the rolls (G) in a desired orientation wherein the cage is composed of a flat ring (J) which bears against the heads of the rolls (G) between inner and outer race members, and bent lugs (K) integral with the ring (J) and which extends between adjacent rolls (G), wherein the lugs (K) include reduced neck portions (L) to provide clearance for the enlarged head of the rolls (G). See page 2, lines 1-19 of Bower.

The Office Action asserts that Figure 2 shows the “pair of tongues” extending radially away from a base (K) for the purpose of spacing and retaining the rolls (G). Applicants respectfully submit that Bower fails to teach or suggest the “tongues” extending toward an annulus of the cage. Rather, as shown in Figure 2 of Bower, while the “tongues” appear to be extending radially away from a body of the bent lug (K), there is no teaching or suggestion that the “tongues” of Bower extend toward an annulus of the cage. Moreover, since Figure 2 is a cross-sectional view of the cage and

Figure 1 is a sectional edge elevational view of the cage that does not provide any indication as to whether the “tongues” extend toward or away from an annulus of the cage, Applicants respectfully submit that Bower fail to teach or suggest the structural features that are admitted to not being taught by Matsui and Murai.

Put simply, Bower does not cure or otherwise address the deficiency of Matsui and Murai

For at least this reason, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1 and 6 are not rendered obvious in view of the combined teachings of Matsui/Bower and Murai/Bower, and should therefore be deemed allowable.

Claims 2-5 and 10-12 depend from Claim 1. Claims 7-9 and 13-15 depend from Claim 6. It is respectfully submitted that these dependent claims be deemed allowable for at least the same reason(s) Claims 1 and 6 are allowable, as well as for the additional subject matter recited therein.

Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, allowance of the Claims 1-15, and the prompt issuance of a Notice of Allowability are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place this application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

In the event this paper is not considered to be timely filed, the Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension, together with any additional fees that may be due with respect to this paper, may be charged to counsel's Deposit Account No. 01-2300, **referencing docket number 100725.00123.**

Respectfully submitted,
ARENT FOX LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Murat Ozgu', is written over the printed name.

Murat Ozgu
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 44,275

Customer No. 004372

1050 Connecticut Avenue, NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20036-5339
Telephone: (202) 857-6000

MO/elp